

Ser. No. 09/931,649

REMARKS

Applicant graciously appreciates the Office's attention to the instant application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims of the instant application. This response is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the September 14, 2004 Office Action. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-17 and 19-31 are currently amended and claims 1-31 are pending.

Oath/Declaration

Applicant appreciates the Office's attention to the papers requesting the addition of two inventors. Applicant notes that the Office requests no further action of Applicant in this regard.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Applicant appreciates the Office's thoughtful comments in light of 35 USC §101 and the Office's suggested amendments to preambles of claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 20, 26 and 30. Applicant currently amends these claims to include "executing on a computer-readable medium", as suggested by the Office. Applicant respectfully asserts that these amendments are solely for the purposes of §101 and that these amendments do not pertain to any art of record.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b): Begole et al.

In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims 1-4, 7-9, 16-20, 22, 25-26, 29 and 30 as being anticipated by the document entitled "Flexible Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred to herein as the Begole reference.

Ser. No. 09/931,649

Claims 1, 9, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, and 30

1 In response, Applicant currently amends claims 1, 9, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29,
 2 and 30 to indicate that the first framework and the second framework are different
 3 types of frameworks. While the instant application discusses various types of
 4 frameworks, Applicant has chosen to currently amend claims 1, 9, 16, 19, 20, 25,
 5 26, 29 and 30 to recite a "bytecode framework" and an "intermediate language
 6 code framework".

7 Applicant respectfully submits that the Begole reference focuses on a single
 8 framework, i.e., the JAVATM framework. More specifically, the Begole reference
 9 focuses on "a Java-based collaboration transparency system for serializable,
 10 Swing-based Java applications, called Flexible JAMM (Java Applets Made
 11 Multiuser)" (Begole reference at page 95). The authors of the Begole reference
 12 implemented the Flexible JAMM system on the JAVATM framework (or what the
 Begole reference calls "the Java platform") for several reasons:

13 First, aside from any inherent programming features, Java is
 14 especially attractive for writing collaborative software because it
 15 simplifies distributing software and largely eliminates platform
 compatibility issues

16 Begole reference at page 111.

17 Thus, the Begole reference discloses and teaches selection of an arbitrary
 18 application platform (specifically, the JAVATM framework) that can run on many
 19 different types of computing machines without issues.

20 Further, in Section 4.1 Procedures and Methods (page 120), the Begole
 21 reference compares Flexible JAMM to Microsoft's NetMeeting using a JAVATM
 22 framework-based text editor application called Notepad. Thus, the Begole
 23 reference teaches use of a pre-existing JAVATM framework-based application that
 24 is already designed to run on Flexible JAMM and Microsoft's NetMeeting. Yet
 25 further, the Begole reference then discusses the merits of its single framework
 solution (see, e.g., Table IV, page 126). In contrast, the subject matter of the

Ser. No. 09/931,649

1 currently amended claims is directed to methods (or computer-readable media)
2 that allow a code associated with a first framework to operate on a second,
3 different framework. Applicant respectfully submits that the Begole reference
4 does not disclose or teach such subject matter.

5 *Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 17, 18 and 22*

6 Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 depend on claim 1, which is currently amended.
7 Claims 3, 4 are currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above,
8 Applicant submits that claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 are not anticipated by the Begole
9 reference.

10 Claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 16, which is currently amended. Claim
11 17 is currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant
12 submits that claims 17 and 18 are not anticipated by the Begole reference.

13 Claim 22 depends on claim 20, which is currently amended. Claim 22 is
14 currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant
15 submits that claim 20 is not anticipated by the Begole reference.

16 Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a): Begole et al. and Stroustrup

17 *Claims 5, 6 and 8*

18 In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims
19 5, 6, and 8 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible
20 Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated
21 Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred
22 to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997,
23 referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

24 Claims 5, 6 and 8 depend on claim 1, which is currently amended. Claims
25 5 and 6 are currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above,
Applicant submits that claims 5, 6 and 8 are patentable over the Begole reference
in view of the Stroustrup reference.

Scr. No. 09/931,649

Claims 10-15 and 31

In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims 10-15 and 31 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997, referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

In response, Applicant currently amends independent claims 10, 13, 15 and 31 to indicate that the first framework and the second framework are different types of frameworks. While the instant application discusses various types of frameworks, Applicant has chosen to currently amend claims 10, 13, 15 and 31 to recite a "bytecode framework" and an "intermediate language code framework". Applicant respectfully directs the Office's attention to the reasons presented above as to what the Begole reference discloses or teaches.

Claims 11 and 12 depend on claim 10, which is currently amended, and claim 14 depends on claim 13, which is currently amended. Claim 12 is currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant submits that claims 10-15 and 31 are patentable over the Begole reference in view of the Stroustrup reference.

Applicant notes that the Office discusses claim 30 in this group as well. For the reasons given above, Applicant submits that claim 30 is patentable over the Begole reference in view of the Stroustrup reference.

Claims 27-28

In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims 27 and 28 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred

Ser. No. 09/931,649

1 to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997,
2 referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

3 Claims 27 and 28 depend on claim 26, which is currently amended. Claims
4 27 and 28 are amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant
5 submits that claims 27 and 28 are patentable over the Begole reference in view of
6 the Stroustrup reference.

7 *Claims 21, 23 and 24*

8 In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims
9 21, 23 and 24 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible
10 Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated
11 Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred
12 to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997,
13 referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

14 Claims 21, 23 and 24 depend on claim 20, which is currently amended.
15 Claims 21, 23 and 24 are amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above,
16 Applicant submits that claims 21, 23 and 24 are patentable over the Begole
17 reference in view of the Stroustrup reference.

18 Conclusion

19 Pending claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully
20 requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any
21 issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact
22 the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

23
24 Respectfully Submitted,
25

Ser. No. 09/931,649

Dated:

By:

[Signature] #32,618
for Brian Pangre
Reg. No. 42,973
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
(509) 324-9256

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25